

# EXHIBIT A

**Young, Cassidy T.**

---

**From:** Shimota, Jim A.  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 8, 2023 4:03 PM  
**To:** KPadmanabhan@winston.com; SRaghavan@winston.com  
**Cc:** EntropicKLG; KENNETH BRIDGES  
**Subject:** Entropic v. Comcast: Rule 12 Hearing

KP/Saranya:

In preparing for oral argument including the statements in Comcast's reply brief regarding the inapplicability of DJ cases to the subject matter jurisdiction issues, we located a body of caselaw that we believe are dispositive of the Rule 12(b)(1) motion. We assume that Comcast had not located these cases previously since they were not cited to the Court. We intend to present them to the Court tomorrow. The cases are:

- *Air Prod. & Chemicals, Inc. v. Reichhold Chemicals, Inc.*, 755 F.2d 1559, 1563-64 (Fed. Cir. 1985)
- *Pixton v. B & B Plastics, Inc.*, 291 F.3d 1324, 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2002)
- *Highway Equip. Co., Inc. v. FECO, Ltd.*, 469 F.3d 1027, 1033 n.1 (Fed. Cir. 2006)
- *Cooper Notification, Inc. v. Twitter, Inc.*, 545 Fed. App'x 959, 967 (Fed. Cir. 2013)
- *Applied Biosystems Group v. Illumina, Inc.*, 282 F. Supp. 2d 1120, 1125 (N.D. Cal. 2003)
- *Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Rambus, Inc.*, 440 F. Supp. 2d 495, 504 (E.D. Va. 2006)

Best regards,

Jim